

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
BEAUFORT DIVISION**

Del Webb Communities, Inc. )  
and PulteGroup, Inc., )  
 )  
Plaintiffs/Petitioners, )  
 )  
v. )  
 )  
Roger F. Carlson and Mary Jo Carlson, )  
 )  
Defendants/Respondents. )  
\_\_\_\_\_ )

C.A. No.: 9:14-cv-1877-PMD

**ORDER**

This matter is before the Court on Defendants/Respondents Roger F. Carlson and Mary Jo Carlson’s motion to reconsider the Court’s February 1 order (ECF No. 115). For the reasons set forth herein, the Carlsons’ motion is denied.

**DISCUSSION**

The Carlsons’ motion to reconsider pursuant to Rule 59(e) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure recites the same arguments set forth in the Carlsons’ original briefs. The Carlsons have not shown an intervening change in the controlling law, new evidence that was not available at the time of the Court’s order, or that there has been a clear error of law or a manifest injustice. *See Robinson v. Wix Filtration Corp., LLC*, 599 F.3d 403, 407 (4th Cir. 2010). As a result, the Carlsons’ motion to reconsider must be denied. *See Hartsock v. Goodyear Dunlop Tires N. Am. Ltd.*, No. 2:13-cv-419-PMD, 2014 WL 11022098, at \*1 (D.S.C. June 16, 2014) (“A motion for reconsideration . . . ‘is not an opportunity to rehash issues already ruled upon because a litigant is displeased with the result.’” (quoting *Joe Hand Promotions, Inc. v. Double Down Entm’t, LLC*, No. 0:11-cv-2438-MBS, 2012 WL 6210344, at \*2 (D.S.C. Dec. 13, 2012))).

**CONCLUSION**

For the foregoing reasons, it is **ORDERED** that the Carlsons' motion to reconsider is **DENIED**.

**AND IT IS SO ORDERED.**

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
PATRICK MICHAEL DUFFY  
United States District Judge

**February 22, 2017**  
**Charleston, South Carolina**